

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
CIVIL MINUTES—
GENERAL

Case No. 5:22-cv-01291-SSS-SHKx

Date July 8, 2024

Title *A.J.P., et al. v. County of San Bernardino, et al.*

Present: The Honorable SUNSHINE S. SYKES, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Irene Vazquez

Not Reported

Deputy Clerk

Court Reporter

Attorney(s) Present for Plaintiff(s):

Attorney(s) Present for Defendant(s):

None Present

None Present

Proceedings: (IN CHAMBERS) ORDER DENYING UNOPPOSED *EX PARTE* APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF THE COMPROMISE OF THE CLAIMS OF MINOR PLAINTIFFS A.J.P., A.M.P. [DKT. 53]

Before the Court is Plaintiffs A.J.P. and A.M.P.’s Unopposed *Ex Parte* Application for Approval of the Compromise of the Claims of Minor Plaintiffs A.J.P., A.M.P. [Dkt. 53].

To justify *ex parte* relief, the moving party must make two showings: (1) “the evidence must show that the moving party’s cause will be irreparably prejudiced if the underlying motion is heard according to regular noticed motion procedures”; and (2) “it must be established that the moving party is without fault in creating the crisis that requires *ex parte* relief, or that the crisis occurred as a result of excusable neglect.” *Mission Power Eng’g Co. v. Cont’l Cas. Co.*, 883 F. Supp. 488, 492 (C.D. Cal. 1995).

Here, Plaintiffs fail to explain why *ex parte* relief is justified. They do not show that they will be irreparably prejudiced if their request was heard through a regularly noticed motion. And they do not show that the moving party is without fault in creating the crisis, or that the crisis occurred because of their excusable neglect.

Accordingly, the *ex parte* application is **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.